

Multi-source Unsupervised Domain Adaptation on Graphs with Transferability Modeling

Tianxiang Zhao

The Pennsylvania State University
State College, USA
tkz5084@psu.edu

Xiang Zhang

The Pennsylvania State University
State College, USA
xzz89@psu.edu

Dongsheng Luo

Florida International University
Miami, USA
dluo@fiu.edu

Suhang Wang

The Pennsylvania State University
State College, USA
szw494@psu.edu

Abstract

In this paper, we tackle a new problem of *multi-source unsupervised domain adaptation (MSUDA) for graphs*, where models trained on annotated source domains need to be transferred to the unannotated target graph for node classification. Due to the discrepancy in distribution across domains, the key challenge is how to select good source instances and how to adapt the model. Diverse graph structures further complicate this problem, rendering previous MSUDA approaches less effective. In this work, we present the framework Selective Multi-source Adaptation for Graph (SelMAG), with a graph-modeling-based domain selector, a sub-graph node selector, and a bi-level alignment objective for the adaptation. Concretely, to facilitate the identification of informative source data, the similarity across graphs is disentangled and measured with the transferability of a graph-modeling task set, and we use it as evidence for source domain selection. A node selector is further incorporated to capture the variation in transferability of nodes within the same source domain. To learn invariant features for adaptation, we align the target domain to selected source data both at the embedding space by minimizing the optimal transport distance and at the classification level by distilling the label function. Modules are explicitly learned to select informative source data and conduct the alignment in virtual training splits with a meta-learning strategy. Experimental results on five graph datasets show the effectiveness of the proposed method.

CCS Concepts

• **Computing methodologies** → **Neural networks; Statistical relational learning; Transfer learning.**

Keywords

graph neural networks, transfer learning, domain adaptation

ACM Reference Format:

Tianxiang Zhao, Dongsheng Luo, Xiang Zhang, and Suhang Wang. 2024. Multi-source Unsupervised Domain Adaptation on Graphs with Transferability Modeling. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining (KDD '24)*, August 25–29, 2024, Barcelona, Spain. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 11 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3637528.3671829>

1 Introduction

Graph neural networks (GNNs) have shown great ability in representation learning on graphs, especially the node classification task [36, 68]. Nevertheless, the success of GNNs heavily relies on label information; while for many real-world applications, obtaining label information is costly and time-consuming [33, 46]. The lack of label information challenges many existing GNNs. In practice, one often has access to multiple annotated domains in training. For example, social networks may be collected from different platforms, communities of different ethnicities, and users speaking different languages. For a newly-collected social network, typically node labels are unknown and we want to classify them with models trained from those source domains. Recent years have featured a trend toward transferring knowledge across datasets to alleviate the lack of supervision [10, 21], which motivates us to explore the application of GNNs trained on annotated datasets (source domains) to the new unlabeled dataset (target domain) [30, 63] (the inductive setting). This scenario can be generalized to a new learning problem: *multi-source unsupervised domain adaptation (MSUDA) for graphs* as shown in Fig. 1.

There are some significant challenges in solving the MSUDA task [56, 74]: (1) the mismatch between data distributions of the source and target domains, which requires an implicit or explicit adaptation of the trained model [4, 5]; (2) A clear discrepancy also exists among multiple source domains, hampering the effectiveness of mainstream single-source domain adaptation methods [15, 58]. Explorations have been made addressing these challenges. Existing methods differentiate the effects of source domains on the target one by computing domain similarities from the lens of different perspectives, such as conditional distribution probability [12, 55], and estimation with an adversarial discriminator [74], etc. Then, they can transform it into a single-source problem via re-weighting and conduct alignment for the adaptation [43]. Furthermore, [3,

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than the author(s) must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.
KDD '24, August 25–29, 2024, Barcelona, Spain

© 2024 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM.
ACM ISBN 979-8-4007-0490-1/24/08
<https://doi.org/10.1145/3637528.3671829>




Figure 1: An example of MSUDA for graphs. We want to transfer knowledge from annotated source domains $\{G_s^1, G_s^2, G_s^3\}$ to G_t . Regions of the same color denote similar node attributes. It can be observed that source domains and sub-graphs of each domain are of different importance in adapting to G_t w.r.t node distributions.

16, 41] provide a performance bound of adapting from a weighted combination of source domains to the target domain.

However, all the aforementioned methods are designed for independent and identically distributed (i.i.d) data; while the complex graph structures bring new challenges to MSUDA. In graph-structured data, nodes are interconnected with edges, and the number of possible topology structures grows exponentially with the graph size. This rich and highly-diverse input space offers increased freedom for the mapping in <graph structure, node annotation> pairs. As a result, computing domain similarities in the input or embedding space and taking it as the estimation of informativeness for node classification could be unreliable, and it is unsafe to assume that nodes of the same source domain would carry a similar level of knowledge for this transfer, as the example in Fig. 1. It is difficult to identify subsets of source domains containing discriminative knowledge to transfer to the target domain due to the intricate nature of graphs. Furthermore, complex graph structures also rise difficulties in alleviating discrepancy among domains, rendering the conventional approach of aligning only in the embedding domain less-effective [15, 40].

To address the aforementioned challenges, we propose to comprehensively depict the similarity between graphs from multiple views, such as distribution of node attributes, edge existences, topological structures, etc. The informativeness of source graphs should further be modeled in aware of the downstream node classification task, and at both graph and node levels to prevent sub-optimal adaptations. As shown in [5], the performance of domain adaptation is bounded by the discrepancy in distribution between the source and the target data set, and a tighter adaptation bound can be derived by identifying subsets of source data that are more similar to the target domain [3, 16]. With beneficial source data identified, we can achieve the adaptation through aligning the embedding learning and label prediction processes.

Concretely, we design the first framework, SelMAG, for MSUDA on graphs. First, a set of graph modeling tasks are selected to capture the graph distribution of each domain. The transferability of models trained on these tasks provides a numeric estimation of domain similarity from different perspectives. Then, based on obtained similarity measurements, a source-graph selector is designed to identify informative source domains towards the target domain on the target downstream task. Furthermore, a sub-graph node selector

is adopted to assign different important scores to nodes of the same source domain. It can help conduct more fine-grained selections and meanwhile alleviate the target shift problem (like when class proportions are different) [47]. Virtual training splits are designed to explicitly optimize these selectors in capturing transferability across graph domains with Meta-learning [24]. Finally, an optimal-transport-based alignment is conducted both in the embedding space and the classification space. Our main contributions are:

- We study a novel problem of MSUDA for graph-structured data, by selecting informative source data and adapting in both the embedding and classification space.
- To identify sub-graphs of source domains that can transfer discriminative knowledge, we design a modeling-based graph selector and a sub-graph node selector, and explicitly train them on the selection-and-adapt pipeline with meta-learning.
- We design an adaptation objective by conducting bi-level alignments with optimal transport and knowledge distillation, which can intrinsically incorporate the learned informativeness of source domains simultaneously.
- Experimental evaluations show that SelMAG achieves state-of-the-art performance on five datasets, validating its design. Case studies further show the ability of SelMAG in capturing the informativeness of source domains.

2 Related Work

2.1 Graph Neural Network

With the increasing need for learning on relational data structures [18, 22], various graph neural networks have been designed, which can be categorized into spectral approaches [11, 36, 57] and spatial approaches [2, 30, 66]. Despite their differences, most GNNs fit within the framework of message-passing [28], in which nodes are iteratively updated by aggregating messages from local neighborhoods. For instance, GCN [36] passes messages from neighboring nodes with fixed weights, GAT [59] applies the self-attention mechanism to learn different attention scores and selects neighborhood messages dynamically. Some works [1, 39, 67] augment GNNs with explicit prototypes to hierarchically model the motif structures and increase the data efficiency. Other works [65, 71, 77] propose to uncover latent groups of nodes or edges and pass messages on the disentangled graph. Recently, explorations have also been made over the trustworthiness of graph neural networks [20, 51, 52, 61] and their explainability [19, 75].

Despite the great success of GNNs, their success usually hinges upon the availability of labeled training data, especially for the task of node classification [36, 78]. However, in practice, for a newly-forming or low-resource target graph, its nodes are usually unlabeled. The lack of labeled data challenges many existing GNN classifiers. Thus, we often need to adapt a model trained from mature source domains which have abundant label information to the target domain. However, distribution shifts often exist between the source domains and the target domain, which calls for the development of domain adaptation algorithms on graph [63]. Particularly, as there are usually multiple labeled source domains can be exploited, we propose to study a novel problem of multi-source domain unsupervised adaptation on graphs, which aims to

adapt classifiers from multiple source graphs to the target unlabeled graph.

2.2 Unsupervised Domain Adaptation

Unsupervised domain adaptation (UDA) aims to transfer the knowledge learned from labeled source domains to the unlabeled target domain [4, 5, 49, 60]. To adapt the knowledge from the source domains to the target domain, one major challenge is how to address the distribution shift between source and target domains. Most recent UDA methods focus on aligning source and target domains by learning domain-invariant features [23, 58], encouraging features to follow the same distribution regardless of which domain they come from [60]. To reduce the distribution discrepancy, some works [40, 53, 69] propose to minimize a divergence that measures the distance between distributions. [8, 27] propose to learn representations that can reconstruct the data distribution of the target domain. Other works [15, 58] use adversarial learning to fool a discriminator which is trained to differentiate between two distributions. The aforementioned approaches are all designed for i.i.d data. Recently, there are few works on domain adaptation on other data structures, e.g., graph data [42, 73], text data [13, 48, 50, 64, 72], etc. For example, UDA-GCN [63] extends adversary alignment [58] to graphs with an attentive feature extractor to learn the invariant features. Overall, it is non-trivial to formulate graph distribution and design adaptive models considering its highly-diverse topology, graph size, and node features [62, 63].

Particularly, this work is related to multi-source unsupervised domain adaptation. This task is complicated further by distribution discrepancy among source domains [14, 38, 44, 70]. Theoretical analyses have been provided w.r.t the performance bound of multi-source unsupervised domain adaptation [3, 16, 41], showing the importance of selecting important source domains. Explorations have been made in measuring domain similarities with conditional distribution probability from the smoothness assumption [12, 55]. Zhao et al. [74] uses an adversarial discriminator and conducts the worst-case alignment, and Nguyen et al. [43] adopts a model-based similarity estimation. However, all these methods are designed for i.i.d data and have difficulty in applying to graphs. In this work, addressing the highly-diverse graph structures, we propose to design a domain selector based on disentangled similarity measurements with graph-modeling tasks and further conduct sub-domain selection with a node-level selector, which is better in estimating informativeness of source domains w.r.t node classification of the target graph.

3 Preliminary

3.1 Notations and Problem Definition

Semi-supervised Node Classification. We focus on the node-level classification task in this work. Specifically, we use $G = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}; F, A)$ to denote a graph, where \mathcal{V} is the node set and $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}$ is the set of edges. Nodes are accompanied by an attribute matrix $F \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{V}| \times d}$, and i -th row of F is the d -dimensional attributes of the corresponding node. \mathcal{E} is described by an adjacency matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{V}| \times |\mathcal{V}|}$. $A_{vu} = 1$ if there is an edge between node v and u ; otherwise, $A_{vu} = 0$. $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{V}|}$ is the class information for nodes in G , obtained with an unknown labeling function f , and

$R(Y)$ is the number of classes. During training, only a subset of Y , \bar{Y} is available, containing the labels for the training node set. Based on those labeled nodes, a hypothesis model h is trained to recover the unknown function f and to predict node classes:

$$h(v; G) \rightarrow Y_v, \quad \forall v \in \mathcal{V}. \quad (1)$$

Multi-source Unsupervised Graph Adaptation. We use *domain* to define a distribution over the graph generation and its latent labeling function, denoted as $\langle D, f \rangle$. In this multi-source graph adaptation, we have partially labeled graphs collected from K source domains as $\mathcal{G}_s = \{G_s^k, \bar{Y}_s^k\}_{k=1}^K$ and an unsupervised graph G_t from the target domain. Each source graph G_s^k is generated following the distribution D_s^k and its \bar{Y}_s^k is obtained with latent labeling function f_s^k . The objective is to build a hypothesis classifier h_t that works well on the target domain $\langle D_t, f_t \rangle$, predicting classes of nodes in G_t accurately. Concretely, the task can be formalized as:

Given K partially labeled graphs $\{G_s^k, \bar{Y}_s^k\}_{k=1}^K$ from different source domains and an unsupervised graph G_t from the target domain $\langle D_t, f_t \rangle$, we aim to train a node classification model h_t to simulate f_t with a small loss $\mathcal{L}(f_t(G_t), h_t(G_t))$ on the target graph G_t .

3.2 Optimal Transport for DA

Optimal Transport (OT) provides a theoretic tool for computing distances between probability distributions and for alignment-based domain adaptation [15], on which our method SelMAG is developed. In this section, we provide an introduction to its key concepts and some important results used in the following sections. The OT problem searches for a plan with the minimum cost to transform a distribution D_s (over space Ω_s) to another distribution D_t (over space Ω_t). The cost of transforming each element is measured by a cost function $c : \Omega_s \times \Omega_t \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$. Following the Monge mass transfer problem [6], the search of transport plan T with minimum total transportation cost $C(T)$ can be expressed as:

$$\begin{aligned} \arg \min_T C(T) &= \int_{\Omega_s} c(\mathbf{x}, T(\mathbf{x})) dD_s(\mathbf{x}), \\ \text{s.t. } T\#D_s &= D_t, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where $T()$ denotes the transport plan and $D_s()$ means the distribution function in the source domain. $T\#D_s$ is the *image measure* of D_s by T [15], another probability measure defined over Ω_t satisfying:

$$T\#D_s(B) = D_s(T^{-1}(B)), \quad \forall \text{ Borel subset } B \subset \Omega_t \quad (3)$$

This guarantees that T is a transport map from D_s to D_t . In practice, cost function c is usually set as the squared Euclidean distance [15]. As shown in [35], a convex relaxation of Eq. (2) can be derived as:

$$\arg \min_{\gamma \in \Pi} \int_{\Omega_s \times \Omega_t} c(\mathbf{x}_s, \mathbf{x}_t) d\gamma(\mathbf{x}_s, \mathbf{x}_t), \quad (4)$$

where Π is defined to be the set of all probabilistic couplings in $P(\Omega_s \times \Omega_t)$ with marginals D_s and D_t . γ can be understood as a joint probability measure for the transportation plan.

To expose the connection between optimal transport and domain adaptation, following previous analysis [4, 47], the error bound of applying source models to the target domain can be summarized




Figure 2: Adaptation process of SelMAG. Source importance is estimated with a global graph selector and sub-graph node selector, and is incorporated into this bi-level alignment.

as:

$$\epsilon_t(h) \leq \sum_{k=1}^K \alpha_k \cdot \epsilon_k(h) + \lambda^* + d_{\mathcal{H}}\left(\sum_{k=1}^K \alpha_k D_k, D_t\right), \quad (5)$$

where the first term represents errors on source domains, $\lambda^* = \min_h \{\epsilon_t(h) + \sum_{k=1}^K \alpha_k \epsilon_k(h)\}$ is the optimal joint error and is a constant, while $d_{\mathcal{H}}(\sum_{k=1}^K \alpha_k D_k, D_t)$ measures \mathcal{H} -divergence across two distributions. To achieve a low error on the target domain, the discrepancy between the distribution of the target domain and that of source domains needs to be minimized (the third term), which can be achieved by aligning them in the embedding space, corresponds to learning a generalizable feature extractor across domains and minimizing the optimal transportation cost $\min_T C(T)$ on it [15].

4 Methodology

In this section, we provide details of SelMAG, which can identify informative subsets of source domains utilizing disentangled domain-level similarities together with sub-domain node-level selections. An overview of the adaptation process is provided in Fig. 2.

4.1 Learning of Source Models

As we have labels for source domains, we can train a set of source models $\{h_s^k\}_{k=1}^K$, one for each domain, using the labeled data. Those models will be used to train a target model h_t later. Specifically, each hypothesis model h is composed of two parts, a feature extraction module g_{ext} (with stacked GNN layers) and a classifier module g_{cls} (as an MLP). Taking node v from G_s^i as an example, the feature extraction module first learns node representation of v as:

$$x_v = g_{\text{ext}}^i(v; G_s^i), \quad (6)$$

With the learned node representation x_v , the classifier module predict the label of node v :

$$\hat{P}_v = g_{\text{cls}}^i(x_v), \quad (7)$$

$\hat{P}_v \in \mathbb{R}^{R(Y)}$ with each dimension representing the predicted probability of v belonging to the corresponding class. For each source graph G_s^i , cross-entropy loss is used for learning:

$$\min_{h_s^i} \mathcal{L}_{CE} = - \sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}_i} \sum_{c=1}^{R(Y)} \mathbf{1}(\bar{Y}_v == c) \cdot \log(\hat{P}_v[c]), \quad (8)$$

where \mathcal{V}_i denotes the labeled node set of G_s^i . To promote the alignment in the embedding space, we adopt a hard parameter sharing on the feature extractor of all source domains and leave the classifier modules domain-specific.

The target model h_t is learned upon two objectives: (1) aligning embeddings of the target graph to those of selected informative subsets of source graphs with a loss derived from optimal transport theory, and (2) the classification loss on pseudo labels generated with source models through a weighted distillation strategy. Details of them will be introduced in the following sections.

4.2 Estimate Transferability of Source Domains

Distribution shifts result in different levels of transferability from source domains to G_t , and sub-graphs of the same domain would also vary in importance for transferring discriminative features. To identify informative subsets of source graphs that can be transferred to the target domain, we adopt a coarse-to-fine paradigm. First, a graph-level selector is designed conditioned on factorized similarity measurements and then a node-level selector is proposed to capture informative subsets of each source graph. We will go into detail about them in this section.

4.2.1 Modeling-based Graph Selector. In this part, we introduce the design of the graph-level selector based on similarities that are factorized into the transferability of different graph modeling tasks. Generally, if prediction models trained on graph G_i can perform well on G_t , then G_i and G_t are similar in some ways. A set of self-supervision tasks can be designed to model the graph distribution from different perspectives, and we can train on G_s^k and test the performance on G_t to obtain disentangled similarity measurements. Various self-supervision tasks can be adopted. In this paper, we adopt the following three self-supervision tasks related to graph structure/properties, which can better model graph distribution for measuring the transferability. We leave the exploration of other tasks as future work.

- Node Prediction [32]. In this task, we randomly mask a ratio of nodes of the graph as input, and the objective is to predict the attributes of those masked nodes.
- Edge Prediction [34]. We randomly sample a set of edges for training, and the objective is to predict the existence of edges for a random pair of nodes.
- Context Prediction [32]. Based on node attributes, we cluster the nodes of those graphs into multiple groups with the K-Means algorithm. Then, for each node, we obtain its so-called ‘‘context’’ as the group distribution of its direct neighborhood. The objective is to predict obtained context for each node.

It can be seen that these self-supervised learning (SSL) tasks focus on different aspects of the graph and have different reliance upon typical graph elements: nodes, edges, and neighborhood topology. *The transferability of these tasks between each source graph and the target graph can depict their similarities from different perspectives, which could be used to evaluate the informativeness of each source graph towards the downstream node classification task.*

We use g_T^i to denote the prediction module w.r.t SSL task T on graph G_i , as shown in Fig. 2. Concretely, first, we train modules $\{g_T\}_{T \in \mathcal{T}}$ w.r.t these graph modeling tasks (denoted as \mathcal{T}) for

each graph respectively. Then, we quantify the transferability of these SSL tasks from graph j to graph t as the performance after exchanging the trained modules:

$$s_T^{j \rightarrow t} = \mathbb{E}_{v \in \mathcal{V}_t} \mathcal{L}_T(g_T^j(x_v), G_t), \quad (9)$$

where \mathcal{V}_t is the node set of G_t , x_v is extracted node embedding following Eq. 6, and $\mathcal{L}_T(g_T^j(x_v), G_t)$ measures loss of task T for node v of G_t . $s_T^{j \rightarrow t}$ denotes the obtained performance of module g_T^j when applied to G_t . Finally, the graph-level selector $g_{\text{sel}}^{\text{global}}$ takes the transferred performance scores on those SSL tasks as input evidence and predicts the informativeness of graph G_j to G_t w.r.t the downstream task as:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{s}_{\text{global}}^{j \rightarrow t} &= g_{\text{sel}}^{\text{global}}(\{s_T^{j \rightarrow t}\}_{T \in \mathcal{T}}, \{s_T^{i \rightarrow t}\}_{T \in \mathcal{T}}) \\ \hat{s}_{\text{global}}^{j \rightarrow t} &= \frac{\hat{s}_{\text{global}}^{j \rightarrow t}}{\sum_{j \neq i} \hat{s}_{\text{global}}^{j \rightarrow t}}, \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where the obtained $\hat{s}_{\text{global}}^{j \rightarrow t} \in [0, 1]$. Note we incorporate the performance $s_T^{i \rightarrow t}$ into the input, which can expose relative performance drop and help evaluate the distribution shift.

4.2.2 Sub-graph Node Selector. The modeling-based selector assigns a weight to each source graph encoding its importance as a whole. However, for each source graph, some of its sub-graphs may be more important than others in adapting to the target domain $\langle D_t, f_t \rangle$. To conduct a more fine-grained selection and identify informative node groups of each source graph, we further design a subgraph-level node selector in this part. Without loss of generality, we implement it as a 2-layer MLP. For each candidate node v of the source graph G_j , we concatenate its embedding with the global representation of target graph G_t as the input:

$$s_{\text{local}}^{j \rightarrow t, v} = g_{\text{sel}}^{\text{local}}(x_v^j, \text{pooling}_{u \in G_t}(x_u^i)), \quad (11)$$

where x_v^j denotes the embedding of node v from graph G_j obtained with its feature extractor following Eq. 6. We take pooled node embeddings of G_j as its graph-level representation. Specifically, we adopt both max-pooling and mean-pooling and concatenate them together to preserve both distinct parts and global patterns of G_t [76]. This selector will give similar weights to source data with similar embeddings in effect.

However, it is challenging to learn these two selectors with back-propagation on the adaptation performance due to the unsupervised target domain. Hence, we propose to optimize them with meta-level updates, which will be introduced in Sec. 4.4.

4.3 Alignment-based Domain Adaptation

With transferability between source graphs and the target graph encoded, in this section, we introduce our strategy to incorporate it into the adaptation process to train the classifier that works for G_t . Previous analysis shows that the error of cross-domain adaptation is bounded by both the global divergence across two domains and the class-wise distribution shifts (which can be measured as the optimal joint error) [4, 56]. Therefore, we design the learning objectives of model h_t by mapping nodes of G_t into the same space as selected data of source domains for aligning embeddings and imitating classification behavior of selected source models for aligning the labeling

functions. Specifically, we design an optimal-transport-based algorithm that is able to utilize extracted transferability intrinsically along with a weighted knowledge distillation mechanism. Details are provided in the following parts.

4.3.1 Selective Optimal Transport for Adaptation. Based on the analysis in Sec. 3.2 and the error bound presented in Eq. 5, adapting the GNN model requires minimizing the distance between the target and source distributions, which can be achieved by reducing the minimum total transportation cost in Eq. 4. To obtain a smoother transport plan and increase the optimization efficiency [17], an entropy-based regularization NE is added and the alignment loss can be formulated as:

$$\min_{\gamma} \mathcal{L}_{\text{OT}} = \int_{\Omega_s \times \Omega_t} c(x_s, x_t) d\gamma(x_s, x_t) + \epsilon NE(\gamma), \quad (12)$$

where $NE(\gamma) = \int_{\Omega_s \times \Omega_t} \gamma(x_s, x_t) \log \gamma(x_s, x_t) dx_s dx_t$ is the negentropy of transport plan γ . This loss can guide the adaptation of the target model to reduce the optimal transport distance between the embedding of source graphs and that of the target graph.

However, this objective neglects the difference in informativeness among source instances toward the target data. In multi-source graph adaptation, different source graphs and sub-graphs of the same graph may contribute differently to the learning of the target model. Addressing this problem, we incorporate the predicted transferability s_{global} and s_{local} into the selective OT-based adaptation objective by augmenting the transport cost. Our basic idea is that the alignment should be focused on source data that have high importance for knowledge transfer to the target graph, and contrarily for the rest of the source data to prevent the problem of negative transfer. Hence, for node v from source graph G_j , the transport cost measurement w.r.t target graph G_t can be calculated as:

$$c^{\text{sel}}(x_v, x_t) = c(x_v, x_t) \cdot s_{\text{global}}^{j \rightarrow t} \cdot s_{\text{local}}^{j \rightarrow t, v}, \quad (13)$$

$c^{\text{sel}}(x_v, x_t)$ is used to replace the original cost measurement $c(x_s, x_t)$ in Eq. 12. This design enables us to select and highlight informative parts of the source graph set during the embedding alignment for model adaptation. For tractable optimization, we can obtain its dual form with the Fenchel-Rockafellar theorem [17]:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\text{SelOT}} &= \max_{\beta} \left\{ \int_{\Omega_s} \beta(x_s) dx_s + \int_{\Omega_t} \beta_{\epsilon}^c(x_t) dx_t \right\} \text{ where} \\ \beta_{\epsilon}^c(x_t) &:= \begin{cases} \min_{x_s} \{c^{\text{sel}}(x_s, x_t) - \beta(x_s)\}, & \epsilon = 0 \\ -\epsilon \log(\mathbb{E}_{x_s} [exp(\frac{\beta(x_s) - c^{\text{sel}}(x_s, x_t)}{\epsilon})]), & \epsilon > 0 \end{cases}, \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

in which $\beta(\cdot)$ is a scoring function and can be simulated with a network. We set ϵ as a small positive number following [43].

4.3.2 Weighted Knowledge Distillation. As the domain adaptation performance is bounded both by the shifts on the embedding space and the shifts on the learned labeling functions [43], to transfer the classification information from source models, we further adopt a knowledge distillation loss to provide training signals in the label space. Concretely, based on the importance score s_{global} of each source model h_s^k , the soft pseudo label of node v in G_t can be obtained as

$$\bar{Y}_{t,v} = \sum_{G_j \in \mathcal{G}_s} h_s^k(v; G_j) \cdot s_{\text{global}}^{j \rightarrow t} \quad (15)$$

Then the target model h_t can be trained as

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{KD}} = \mathbb{E}_{v \in G_t} - \sum_{i=1}^{R(Y)} \bar{Y}_{t,v}[i] \log h_t(v; G_t)[i], \quad (16)$$

where $R(Y)$ is the number of classes, same as the dimension of $\bar{Y}_{t,v}$. $h_t(v; G_t)$ is the output of target model h_t for node v of G_t , with its i -th dimension as predicted probability of falling into class i . This cross-entropy loss will distill the knowledge of learned labeling functions of source domains to the target domain.

4.3.3 Objective Function of SelMAG. Putting everything together, the final learning loss for the alignment-based domain adaptation can be written as:

$$\min_{h_t} \lambda \cdot \mathcal{L}_{\text{SelOT}} + (1 - \lambda) \cdot \mathcal{L}_{\text{KD}}, \quad (17)$$

where λ controls the balance between alignment on the embedding space and that on the labeling function space respectively.

4.4 Optimization with Meta-learning

The adaptation objective in Eq. 17 emphasizes reducing the alignment distance. Directly optimizing the proposed selectors on this domain adaptation task is improper and may result in trivial solutions, as it provides no signals over transferring class-discriminative information and has the danger of highlighting uniformly distributed but non-informative (sub-)graphs. To improve the selective knowledge transfer for domain adaptation, we design a meta-learning-based optimization strategy [24] by simulating the unsupervised domain adaptation setting and guiding the learning of selectors based on performance after adaptation. This “learning to learn” pipeline can provide explicit learning signals for selectors.

Concretely, to make the meta-training process in conformity with the adaptation process and directly optimize it, we propose to directly *learn to select from source graphs* by iteratively conducting two learning steps, inner update, and outer update. Below, we will show how these two steps are designed.

Inner Update. To guarantee consistency, setting on the inner update is designed to be also a multi-source graph adaptation task. For available source graph set \mathcal{G}_s , in each iteration, we sample a pseudo target graph \hat{G}_t and use its complement as pseudo source graphs \hat{G}_s . The target model h_t is updated for T steps on \hat{G}_t following Eq. 17, simulating the process of adaptation. At k -th step, parameters are updated with:

$$\theta_t^k = \theta_t^{k-1} - \alpha \cdot \nabla_{\theta_t^{k-1}} (\lambda \cdot \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{SelOT}} + (1 - \lambda) \cdot \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{KD}}), \quad (18)$$

where θ_t is the parameter of model h_t and α is the optimization step size. Losses $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{SelOT}}$ and $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{KD}}$ are calculated on the pseudo source and target graphs.

Outer Update. Nodes of \hat{G}_t are labeled and can be utilized to evaluate the performance of graph adaptation. Gradients from adapted h_t can be back-propagated to the weights \hat{s}_{global} , \hat{s}_{local} of pseudo source graphs \hat{G}_s , and further, be utilized to optimize the two selectors. Concretely, θ_{sel} can be optimized accordingly to explicitly improve upon “learning to select” as:

$$\theta_{\text{sel}} = \theta_{\text{sel}} - \eta \cdot \sum_{v \in \hat{G}_t} \nabla_{\theta_{\text{sel}}} \mathcal{L}_{\text{cls}}(v; \hat{G}_t), \quad (19)$$

Algorithm 1 Full Training Algorithm

Input: $G_t = (\mathcal{V}_t, E_t; F_t, A_t)$, $\mathcal{G}_s = \{G_s^k, \bar{Y}_s^k\}_{k=1}^K$

Output: Node classifier h_t that works for G_t

- 1: Train node classifiers $\{h_s^k\}_{k=1}^K$ for source graphs
 - 2: For each graph $G_i \in \mathcal{G}_s$, train modules $\{g_T^i\}_{T \in \mathcal{T}}$ w.r.t graph modeling tasks \mathcal{T} in Sec. 4.2.1
 - 3: **while** Not Converged **do**
 - 4: Sample \hat{G}_t, \hat{G}_s from \mathcal{G}_s
 - 5: **for** T inner update steps **do**
 - 6: Estimate s_{global} from \hat{G}_s to \hat{G}_t with $g_{\text{sel}}^{\text{global}}$
 - 7: Estimate s_{local} from \hat{G}_s to \hat{G}_t with $g_{\text{sel}}^{\text{local}}$
 - 8: Update the transport function γ based on Eq. 14 for transportation cost estimation
 - 9: Update h_t following Eq. 18
 - 10: **end for**
 - 11: Evaluate h_t for node classification on \hat{G}_t
 - 12: Update selector parameters θ_{sel} following Eq. 19
 - 13: **end while**
 - 14: Repeat line 5 to line 10 to update h_t on the target graph G_t with source graphs \mathcal{G}_s
 - 15: **return** Trained model h_t for the target graph G_t
-

where θ_{sel} is the parameter of model $g_{\text{sel}}^{\text{global}}$ and $g_{\text{sel}}^{\text{local}}$, η is the learning rate, and \mathcal{L}_{cls} is node classification loss on labeled nodes of \hat{G}_t , with model parameters learned from inner update.

These two steps are performed iteratively and can be summarized in Alg. 1. With inner and outer updates, both selectors are trained to predict informative subsets of source graphs for the target graph w.r.t the downstream node classification task. Therefore, they can be trusted to be applied to G_t afterward this meta-training phase. Following meta-training steps, in adapting to G_t , we will fine-tune the parameter of h_t following Eq. 17, as shown in Alg. 1.

5 Experiment

In this section, we evaluate the proposed SelMAG on 5 real-world datasets. Specifically, we seek to answer the following questions:

- **RQ1:** Can the proposed approach improve the adaptation performance on real-world graph datasets?
- **RQ2:** What is the importance of each component for the success of SelMAG? How would different hyperparameter configurations influence the effectiveness of SelMAG?
- **RQ3:** Would SelMAG be able to capture the importance of each source domain for this knowledge transfer?

5.1 Datasets

To evaluate the effectiveness of SelMAG, we conduct experiments on five publicly available datasets, including Citation [63], Twitch [54], Yelp¹, Cora_full [7] and Arxiv [31]. We provide details of these datasets and our preprocessing in Appendix A.

¹<https://www.yelp.com/dataset>

Table 1: Multi-source graph adaptation performance

Datasets	Metrics	Direct	Single-Source					Multi-Source				
			MMD	Reverse	Adversarial	OptimalT	UDA-GCN	DistMDA	MDAN	MLDG	SelMAG	
Citation	ACC	66.5 \pm 0.13	62.7 \pm 0.31	65.2 \pm 1.22	64.8 \pm 0.83	55.2 \pm 0.69	65.9 \pm 0.35	67.3 \pm 0.24	66.5 \pm 0.19	66.2 \pm 0.12	68.5\pm0.22	
	AUROC	84.1 \pm 0.11	84.4 \pm 0.29	85.7 \pm 0.32	86.1 \pm 0.29	79.6 \pm 0.34	84.7 \pm 0.28	84.5 \pm 0.24	85.5 \pm 0.14	85.6 \pm 0.07	86.3\pm0.09	
	MacroF	64.0 \pm 0.15	61.7 \pm 0.35	62.2 \pm 0.41	60.6 \pm 0.33	48.5 \pm 0.47	62.8 \pm 0.36	63.2 \pm 0.23	62.1 \pm 0.12	62.5 \pm 0.18	64.8\pm0.21	
Twitch	ACC	47.2 \pm 0.12	48.3 \pm 0.44	44.7 \pm 0.0125	48.2 \pm 0.22	52.2 \pm 0.34	49.9 \pm 0.47	51.9 \pm 0.16	52.3 \pm 0.11	53.6 \pm 0.16	57.7 \pm 0.19	
	AUROC	50.9 \pm 0.08	51.1 \pm 0.19	51.3 \pm 0.24	50.7 \pm 0.16	50.9 \pm 0.15	51.2 \pm 0.16	51.1 \pm 0.17	50.9 \pm 0.16	51.6 \pm 0.15	51.7 \pm 0.12	
	MacroF	47.6 \pm 0.14	46.7 \pm 0.22	44.9 \pm 0.46	46.3 \pm 0.37	48.3 \pm 0.26	47.1 \pm 0.31	50.2 \pm 0.14	50.5 \pm 0.08	50.9 \pm 0.07	51.5 \pm 0.08	
Yelp	ACC	74.3 \pm 0.12	74.6 \pm 0.16	74.2 \pm 0.09	74.1 \pm 0.13	74.7 \pm 0.15	75.9 \pm 0.17	76.8 \pm 0.18	78.6 \pm 0.25	76.2 \pm 0.11	79.8\pm0.09	
	AUROC	94.1 \pm 0.17	93.5 \pm 0.13	93.6 \pm 0.11	93.0 \pm 0.09	93.7 \pm 0.04	94.1 \pm 0.15	94.4 \pm 0.12	94.9 \pm 0.14	94.2 \pm 0.05	95.5\pm0.06	
	MacroF	74.4 \pm 0.05	74.8 \pm 0.12	74.0 \pm 0.08	75.3 \pm 0.09	74.1 \pm 0.13	76.5 \pm 0.16	77.8 \pm 0.15	77.7 \pm 0.19	77.3 \pm 0.08	79.5\pm0.11	
Cora_full	ACC	29.4 \pm 0.12	30.3 \pm 0.12	31.5 \pm 0.21	31.9 \pm 0.16	25.4 \pm 0.14	32.2 \pm 0.17	31.9 \pm 0.15	33.3 \pm 0.07	34.2 \pm 0.15	38.3 \pm 0.19	
	AUROC	78.6 \pm 0.17	80.1 \pm 0.14	80.4 \pm 0.19	80.8 \pm 0.08	77.9 \pm 0.07	81.0 \pm 0.13	81.1 \pm 0.11	81.5 \pm 0.04	81.9 \pm 0.22	83.2\pm0.25	
	MacroF	19.7 \pm 0.09	19.9 \pm 0.16	20.7 \pm 0.15	21.5 \pm 0.10	16.2 \pm 0.13	21.5 \pm 0.14	21.8 \pm 0.16	24.1 \pm 0.12	23.5 \pm 0.13	26.4\pm0.08	
Arxiv	ACC	52.7 \pm 0.14	52.6 \pm 0.19	52.8 \pm 0.14	53.1 \pm 0.16	53.3 \pm 0.21	53.4 \pm 0.17	53.5 \pm 0.21	53.8 \pm 0.18	54.2 \pm 0.19	55.4 \pm 0.09	
	AUROC	91.5 \pm 0.09	91.6 \pm 0.13	90.9 \pm 0.13	91.6 \pm 0.17	91.9 \pm 0.10	91.8 \pm 0.16	92.0 \pm 0.15	92.2 \pm 0.14	91.8 \pm 0.18	92.4\pm0.06	
	MacroF	27.4 \pm 0.21	27.1 \pm 0.18	28.9 \pm 0.08	28.6 \pm 0.14	27.5 \pm 0.25	27.9 \pm 0.18	29.2 \pm 0.17	30.1 \pm 0.16	30.4 \pm 0.25	31.2\pm0.17	

5.2 Experiment Settings

5.2.1 Baselines. The proposed method is compared with representative and state-of-the-art single-source adaptation approaches and multi-source adaptation methods. For empirical comparisons, we use the following baselines: **Direct**, **MMD** [69], **Reverse** [25], **Adversarial** [58] [63], **OptimalT** [15], **UDA-GCN** [63], **DistMDA** [55], **MDAN** [74], and **MLDG** [37]. Details are provided in Appendix B.

5.2.2 Configurations. In the experiments, for each dataset, we fix the first 5 graphs as source domains and use the last one as the target domain, and label 10% of nodes for training. All methods share the same backbone network structure of a two-layer GCN [36] and are trained until convergence with the maximum epoch number set to 2,000. For meta-learning, the maximum epoch number of the outer update is also set to 2,000 and the inner update step T is set to 5 following [24]. The Adam optimizer is adopted for all methods, with the learning rate initialized to 0.01 and weight decay as $5e-4$. For a fair comparison, for all baselines, we use grid search to set their hyperparameters. In SelMAG, the hyper-parameter λ is set to 0.3 and μ is set to 0.001 if not stated otherwise.

5.2.3 Evaluation Metrics. We evaluate the adapted model on the target graph and adopt widely used evaluation metrics for node classification, including accuracy (ACC), macro AUC-ROC (AUROC) [9], and macro F1 (MacroF). Both MacroAUC and MacroF are calculated and averaged per class, hence are more indicative of the existence of class imbalance.

5.3 Graph Adaptation Performance

To answer RQ1, we evaluate the performance of different methods after adapting to the target domain on all five datasets. Each experiment is conducted for 5 times with random parameter initialization and train/test splits of source domains, and we report the average results in Table 1. Both the mean and standard deviation w.r.t each metric are presented, with the best performance emboldened. From the results, we can make the following observations:

- Our proposed method, SelMAG, achieves the best performance across all these datasets and outperforms baselines with a clear margin. For example, on dataset Citation and Twitch, it shows an improvement of 1.2% and 4.1% in terms of accuracy compared to the best baseline.
- Adaptation by taking all source domains as equal and neglecting their varying transferability to the target domain often shows weak performances, and may even result in a performance drop compared to no adaptation at all. For example, on dataset Citation, all single-source domain alignment methods show a performance drop in both accuracy and Macro F score compared to the baseline Direct, which trains a global source model and directly applies it to the target domain.
- Compared to other multi-source adaptation methods like DistMDA, SelMAG achieves further improvement, which supports our motivation to capture transferability between graph domains to cope with the highly diverse topology structure.

These results validate the effectiveness of SelMAG, showing its strong performance in the multi-source graph adaptation task.


5.4 Ablation Study

In order to examine the importance of each component and answer RQ2, in this subsection, we conduct a set of ablation studies by removing different parts of SelMAG and test the performance. All hyper-parameters are left unchanged, and each experiment is conducted three times on datasets Twitch, Yelp, and Cora_full with random initialization and train/test splits of source domains. Mean performance and standard deviations are summarized in Table 2.

5.4.1 Source-Graph Selectors. To evaluate the importance of different weights assigned to source domains, we test the performance after removing model-based graph selector (w/o g_{sel}^{global}) and sub-graph node selector (w/o g_{sel}^{local}). These two variants correspond to removing s_{global} and s_{local} in Eq. 13, respectively. From Table 2, it

Table 2: Ablation Study on each framework component.

Methods	Twitch			Yelp			Cora_full		
	ACC	AUROC	MacroF	ACC	AUROC	MacroF	ACC	AUROC	MacroF
SelMAG	57.7 \pm 0.19	51.7 \pm 0.12	51.5 \pm 0.08	79.8 \pm 0.09	95.5 \pm 0.06	79.5 \pm 0.11	38.3 \pm 0.19	83.2 \pm 0.25	26.4 \pm 0.08
w/o g_{sel}^{global}	54.3 \pm 0.13	51.3 \pm 0.15	50.9 \pm 0.09	77.0 \pm 0.11	93.6 \pm 0.08	77.5 \pm 0.14	35.5 \pm 0.25	82.8 \pm 0.22	25.0 \pm 0.16
w/o g_{sel}^{local}	55.2 \pm 0.16	51.5 \pm 0.14	51.0 \pm 0.12	77.7 \pm 0.12	94.7 \pm 0.13	77.8 \pm 0.12	35.7 \pm 0.31	82.6 \pm 0.13	25.4 \pm 0.28
w/o KD	53.7 \pm 0.16	51.4 \pm 0.15	51.1 \pm 0.10	78.9 \pm 0.10	95.1 \pm 0.11	78.1 \pm 0.16	36.5 \pm 0.23	83.0 \pm 0.19	25.7 \pm 0.13
SelAdv	55.3 \pm 0.13	51.6 \pm 0.25	51.4 \pm 0.19	79.5 \pm 0.13	95.2 \pm 0.12	79.2 \pm 0.09	36.8 \pm 0.22	83.1 \pm 0.09	25.9 \pm 0.29


**Figure 3: Influence of the weight of domain alignment loss.**

is shown that both selectors play a positive influence in this multi-source adaptation. Particularly, the model-based graph selector is more important than the sub-graph node selector in most cases, with the variant w/o g_{sel}^{global} showing the worst accuracy in all three datasets. The reason could lie in the utilization of graph modeling tasks which provides clearer evidence for estimating transferability.

5.4.2 Domain Alignment Objectives. To evaluate the importance of aligning the classification function, we implement a variant by removing the weighted knowledge distillation loss \mathcal{L}_{KD} in Eq. 17 and annotate it as “w/o KD”. To test the generalizability of SelMAG with different domain alignment objectives, we further implement a variant SelAdv by replacing OT-based alignment in \mathcal{L}_{SelOT} with adversary-based alignment [74]. Learned weights of source domains can be incorporated into the adversarial aligning process via re-weighting. From Table 2, it can be observed that the weighted knowledge distillation loss is also helpful for the adaptation process, with “w/o KD” showing a drop in adaptation performance. Besides, it is shown that our method can also work for the adversarial alignment with a moderate performance drop, validating its robustness across alignment strategies.

5.5 Sensitivity Analysis

5.5.1 Alignment Weight. To evaluate the domain adaptation objective and partially answer RQ2, we analyze the sensitivity of the SelMAG on hyper-parameters λ , which controls the balance between the embedding alignment loss \mathcal{L}_{SelOT} and the knowledge distillation loss \mathcal{L}_{KD} in Eq. 17. We vary it as $\{0.1, 0.2, 0.3, 0.5, 0.6, 0.8\}$, and experiments are conducted on Twitch and Yelp, with other configurations remaining the same as the main experiment. Each experiment is conducted 3 times, and we report the average accuracy and Macro F score in Fig. 3. It is shown that λ is better set to the range $[0.3, 0.6]$ for both datasets. Setting it too small would weaken the embedding alignment signal while setting it too high would fail to explicitly align the classifier.

**Figure 4: Influence of the hyper-parameter ϵ , which controls optimal transport in Eq. 14.**

5.5.2 Optimal Transport Configuration. To analyze the sensitivity of SelMAG on the optimal transport configuration, in this part we vary ϵ as $\{0.0001, 0.001, 0.01, 0.1, 0.2\}$ which regularizes the transport in Eq. 14. A larger ϵ encourages the transport plan to be smoother [43]. Again, experiments are conducted on Twitch and Yelp for 3 times with all other configurations unchanged. The average results are presented in Fig. 4. It is shown that SelMAG achieves relatively stable performance with a small ϵ within $[0, 0.1]$, in accordance with previous observations [26].

5.6 Analysis on Global and Local Weights

In this subsection, we provide some analysis over learned weights s_{sel}^{global} and s_{sel}^{local} of source graph domains towards the target graph in order to answer RQ3. However, there is no ground-truth transferability between graph pairs w.r.t the downstream node classification task. Therefore, we take a surrogate strategy by evaluating the single-source graph adaptation performance. Single-source graph adaptation is conducted by taking only one source graph as available and using optimal transport for embedding alignment. The accuracy obtained on the target domain after adaptation is reported as DA-ACC. Experiments are conducted on Yelp and Citation, with optimization hyper-parameters set to be the same as introduced in Sec. 5.2.2. For ease of analysis, we apply only the graph selector or the sub-graph node selector respectively to exclude the influence of the other one. Results are summarized in Fig. 5. For s_{sel}^{local} , we report its mean across nodes of the corresponding domain.

From Fig. 5, we can observe that SelMAG tends to assign a higher weight to source domains that show a strong performance in single-source UDA. For example on Yelp, the largest global and local weights are both assigned to 4-th graph, which also shows the strongest UDA performance. On Citation, the 5-th source graph is generated from the same dataset as G_t , and its weights are also high. For important source domains, their average local node weights are also high. These results validate the ability of SelMAG in estimating transferability between graph domains.




Figure 5: Analysis on weights assigned to source domains by g_{sel}^{global} and g_{sel}^{local} , by comparing them to the accuracy obtained with single-source domain adaptation.

6 Conclusion

In this work, we propose a novel framework to identify informative sub-graphs for knowledge transfer in the multi-source graph adaptation task. We depict graph similarities from three perspectives, each captured by a self-supervised graph modeling task, and estimate task-specific cross-domain transferability with a meta-learned selector. An optimal-transport objective and a weighted knowledge distillation objective are designed to incorporate obtained selection scores into the domain alignment process. Experiments on five datasets show that SelMAG outperforms existing methods for MSDA on graphs. In the future, we plan to extend SelMAG to work with emerging new classes. In adapting source models to the target domain, there could be shifts in the label space, like novel classes unseen during training. This scenario calls for the development of a new algorithm.

7 Acknowledgement

This material is based upon work supported by, or in part by the National Science Foundation (NSF) under grant number IIS-1909702, Army Research Office (ARO) under grant number W911NF-21-1-0198, Department of Homeland Security (DHS) CINA under grant number E205949D, and Cisco Faculty Research Award.

References

- [1] Amir Hosein Khas Ahmadi. 2020. *Memory-based graph networks*. Ph. D. Dissertation. University of Toronto (Canada).
- [2] James Atwood and Don Towsley. 2016. Diffusion-convolutional neural networks. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*. 1993–2001.
- [3] Shai Ben-David, John Blitzer, Koby Crammer, Alex Kulesza, Fernando Pereira, and Jennifer Wortman Vaughan. 2010. A theory of learning from different domains. *Machine learning* 79, 1 (2010), 151–175.
- [4] Shai Ben-David, John Blitzer, Koby Crammer, and Fernando Pereira. 2006. Analysis of representations for domain adaptation. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 19 (2006).
- [5] John Blitzer, Koby Crammer, Alex Kulesza, Fernando Pereira, and Jennifer Wortman. 2007. Learning bounds for domain adaptation. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 20 (2007).
- [6] Vladimir I Bogachev and Aleksandr V Kolesnikov. 2012. The Monge-Kantorovich problem: achievements, connections, and perspectives. *Russian Mathematical Surveys* 67, 5 (2012), 785.
- [7] Aleksandar Bojchevski and Stephan Günnemann. 2018. Deep Gaussian Embedding of Graphs: Unsupervised Inductive Learning via Ranking. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*. 1–13.
- [8] Konstantinos Bousmalis, George Trigeorgis, Nathan Silberman, Dilip Krishnan, and Dumitru Erhan. 2016. Domain separation networks. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 29 (2016).
- [9] Andrew P. Bradley. 1997. The use of the area under the ROC curve in the evaluation of machine learning algorithms. *Pattern Recognit.* 30, 7 (1997), 1145–1159. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0031-3203\(96\)00142-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0031-3203(96)00142-2)
- [10] Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. 2020. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 33 (2020), 1877–1901.
- [11] Joan Bruna, Wojciech Zaremba, Arthur Szlam, and Yann LeCun. 2013. Spectral networks and locally connected networks on graphs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.6203* (2013).
- [12] Rita Chattopadhyay, Qian Sun, Wei Fan, Ian Davidson, Sethuraman Panchanathan, and Jieping Ye. 2012. Multisource domain adaptation and its application to early detection of fatigue. *ACM Trans. Knowl. Discov. Data* 6, 4 (2012), 18:1–18:26. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2382577.2382582>
- [13] Bo Chen, Wai Lam, Ivor Tsang, and Tak-Lam Wong. 2009. Extracting discriminative concepts for domain adaptation in text mining. In *Proceedings of the 15th ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*. 179–188.
- [14] Dong Chen, Hongqing Zhu, Suyi Yang, and Yiwen Dai. 2023. Unsupervised multi-source domain adaptation with graph convolution network and multi-alignment in mixed latent space. *Signal, Image and Video Processing* 17, 3 (2023), 855–863.
- [15] Nicolas Courty, Rémi Flamary, Amaury Habrard, and Alain Rakotomamonjy. 2017. Joint distribution optimal transportation for domain adaptation. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 30: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2017, December 4–9, 2017, Long Beach, CA, USA*, Isabelle Guyon, Ulrike von Luxburg, Samy Bengio, Hanna M. Wallach, Rob Fergus, S. V. N. Vishwanathan, and Roman Garnett (Eds.), 3730–3739. <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2017/hash/0070d23b06b1486a538c0eaa45dd167a-Abstract.html>
- [16] Koby Crammer, Michael Kearns, and Jennifer Wortman. 2008. Learning from Multiple Sources. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 9, 8 (2008).
- [17] Marco Cuturi. 2013. Sinkhorn distances: Lightspeed computation of optimal transport. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 26 (2013).
- [18] Enyan Dai, Wei Jin, Hui Liu, and Suhang Wang. 2022. Towards Robust Graph Neural Networks for Noisy Graphs with Sparse Labels. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.00232* (2022).
- [19] Enyan Dai and Suhang Wang. 2021. Towards self-explainable graph neural network. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM International Conference on Information & Knowledge Management*. 302–311.
- [20] Enyan Dai, Tianxiang Zhao, Huaisheng Zhu, Junjie Xu, Zhimeng Guo, Hui Liu, Jiliang Tang, and Suhang Wang. 2022. A Comprehensive Survey on Trustworthy Graph Neural Networks: Privacy, Robustness, Fairness, and Explainability. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.08570* (2022).
- [21] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2018. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805* (2018).
- [22] Wenqi Fan, Y. Ma, Qing Li, Yuan He, Y. Zhao, Jiliang Tang, and D. Yin. 2019. Graph Neural Networks for Social Recommendation. *The World Wide Web Conference* (2019).
- [23] Basura Fernando, Amaury Habrard, Marc Sebban, and Tinne Tuytelaars. 2013. Unsupervised Visual Domain Adaptation Using Subspace Alignment. In *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*.
- [24] Chelsea Finn, Pieter Abbeel, and Sergey Levine. 2017. Model-agnostic meta-learning for fast adaptation of deep networks. In *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 1126–1135.
- [25] Yaroslav Ganin and Victor S. Lempitsky. 2015. Unsupervised Domain Adaptation by Backpropagation. In *Proceedings of the 32nd International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2015, Lille, France, 6–11 July 2015 (JMLR Workshop and Conference Proceedings, Vol. 37)*, Francis R. Bach and David M. Blei (Eds.). JMLR.org, 1180–1189. <http://proceedings.mlr.press/v37/ganin15.html>
- [26] Aude Genevay, Marco Cuturi, Gabriel Peyré, and Francis Bach. 2016. Stochastic optimization for large-scale optimal transport. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 29 (2016).
- [27] Muhammad Ghifary, W Bastiaan Kleijn, Mengjie Zhang, David Balduzzi, and Wen Li. 2016. Deep reconstruction-classification networks for unsupervised domain adaptation. In *Computer Vision—ECCV 2016: 14th European Conference, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, October 11–14, 2016, Proceedings, Part IV 14*. Springer, 597–613.
- [28] Justin Gilmer, Samuel S Schoenholz, Patrick F Riley, Oriol Vinyals, and George E Dahl. 2017. Neural Message Passing for Quantum Chemistry. In *ICML*.
- [29] Shurui Gui, Xiner Li, Limei Wang, and Shuiwang Ji. [n. d.]. GOOD: A Graph Out-of-Distribution Benchmark. In *Thirty-sixth Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems Datasets and Benchmarks Track*.
- [30] William L. Hamilton, Zitao Ying, and J. Leskovec. 2017. Inductive Representation Learning on Large Graphs. In *NIPS*.
- [31] Weihua Hu, Matthias Fey, Marinka Zitnik, Yuxiao Dong, Hongyu Ren, Bowen Liu, Michele Catasta, and Jure Leskovec. 2020. Open graph benchmark: Datasets for machine learning on graphs. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 33 (2020), 22118–22133.
- [32] Weihua Hu, Bowen Liu, Joseph Gomes, Marinka Zitnik, Percy Liang, Vijay Pande, and Jure Leskovec. 2019. Strategies for Pre-training Graph Neural Networks. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- [33] Srikanth Jagabathula, Dmitry Mitrofanov, and Gustavo Vulcano. 2022. Personalized retail promotions through a directed acyclic graph-based representation of customer preferences. *Operations Research* 70, 2 (2022), 641–665.

- [34] Wei Jin, Tyler Derr, Haochen Liu, Yiqi Wang, Suhang Wang, Zitao Liu, and Jiliang Tang. 2020. Self-supervised learning on graphs: Deep insights and new direction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.10141* (2020).
- [35] Leonid V Kantorovich. 2006. On the translocation of masses. *Journal of mathematical sciences* 133, 4 (2006), 1381–1382.
- [36] Thomas N Kipf and Max Welling. 2016. Semi-supervised classification with graph convolutional networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1609.02907* (2016).
- [37] Da Li, Yongxin Yang, Yi-Zhe Song, and Timothy Hospedales. 2018. Learning to generalize: Meta-learning for domain generalization. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, Vol. 32.
- [38] Yunsheng Li, Lu Yuan, Yinpeng Chen, Pei Wang, and Nuno Vasconcelos. 2021. Dynamic transfer for multi-source domain adaptation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 10998–11007.
- [39] Shuai Lin, Chen Liu, Pan Zhou, Zi-Yuan Hu, Shuojia Wang, Ruihui Zhao, Yefeng Zheng, Liang Lin, Eric Xing, and Xiaodan Liang. 2022. Prototypical graph contrastive learning. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems* (2022).
- [40] Mingsheng Long, Yue Cao, Jianmin Wang, and Michael Jordan. 2015. Learning transferable features with deep adaptation networks. In *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 97–105.
- [41] Yishay Mansour, Mehryar Mohri, and Afshin Rostamizadeh. 2008. Domain adaptation with multiple sources. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 21 (2008).
- [42] Haitao Mao, Lun Du, Yujia Zheng, Qiang Fu, Zelin Li, Xu Chen, Shi Han, and Dongmei Zhang. 2021. Source free unsupervised graph domain adaptation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.00955* (2021).
- [43] Tuan Nguyen, Trung Le, He Zhao, Quan Hung Tran, Truyen Nguyen, and Dinh Phung. 2021. Most: Multi-source domain adaptation via optimal transport for student-teacher learning. In *Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*. PMLR, 225–235.
- [44] Xingchao Peng, Qinxun Bai, Xide Xia, Zijun Huang, Kate Saenko, and Bo Wang. 2019. Moment matching for multi-source domain adaptation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*. 1406–1415.
- [45] Jeffrey Pennington, R Socher, and Christopher D. Manning. 2014. Glove: Global Vectors for Word Representation. In *EMNLP*.
- [46] Devakunchari Ramalingam and Valliyammai Chinnaiyah. 2018. Fake profile detection techniques in large-scale online social networks: A comprehensive review. *Computers & Electrical Engineering* 65 (2018), 165–177.
- [47] Ievgen Redko, Nicolas Courty, Rémi Flamary, and Devis Tuia. 2019. Optimal transport for multi-source domain adaptation under target shift. In *The 22nd International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*. PMLR, 849–858.
- [48] Weijie Ren and Vasant G Honavar. 2024. EsaCL: An Efficient Continual Learning Algorithm. In *Proceedings of the 2024 SIAM International Conference on Data Mining (SDM)*. SIAM, 163–171.
- [49] Weijie Ren, Xiaoting Li, Huiyuan Chen, Vineeth Rakesh, Zhuoyi Wang, Mahashweta Das, and Vasant G Honavar. [n. d.]. TabLog: Test-Time Adaptation for Tabular Data Using Logic Rules. In *Forty-first International Conference on Machine Learning*.
- [50] Weijie Ren, Xinlong Li, Lei Wang, Tianxiang Zhao, and Wei Qin. 2024. Analyzing and Reducing Catastrophic Forgetting in Parameter Efficient Tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.18865* (2024).
- [51] Weijie Ren, Lei Wang, Kunpeng Liu, Ruocheng Guo, Lim Ee Peng, and Yanjie Fu. 2022. Mitigating Popularity Bias in Recommendation with Unbalanced Interactions: A Gradient Perspective. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.01154* (2022).
- [52] Weijie Ren, Pengyang Wang, Xiaolin Li, Charles E Hughes, and Yanjie Fu. 2022. Semi-supervised Drifted Stream Learning with Short Lookback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.13066* (2022).
- [53] Weijie Ren, Tianxiang Zhao, Wei Qin, and Kunpeng Liu. 2023. T-SaS: Toward Shift-aware Dynamic Adaptation for Streaming Data. In *Proceedings of the 32nd ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management*. 4244–4248.
- [54] Benedek Rozemberczki and Rik Sarkar. 2021. Twitch Gamers: a Dataset for Evaluating Proximity Preserving and Structural Role-based Node Embeddings. *arXiv:2101.03091* [cs.SI]
- [55] Qian Sun, Rita Chattopadhyay, Sethuraman Panchanathan, and Jieping Ye. 2011. A two-stage weighting framework for multi-source domain adaptation. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 24 (2011).
- [56] Shiliang Sun, Honglei Shi, and Yuanbin Wu. 2015. A survey of multi-source domain adaptation. *Information Fusion* 24 (2015), 84–92.
- [57] S. Tang, Bo Li, and Haijun Yu. 2019. ChebNet: Efficient and Stable Constructions of Deep Neural Networks with Rectified Power Units using Chebyshev Approximations. *ArXiv abs/1911.05467* (2019).
- [58] Eric Tzeng, Judy Hoffman, Kate Saenko, and Trevor Darrell. 2017. Adversarial Discriminative Domain Adaptation. In *2017 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR 2017, Honolulu, HI, USA, July 21-26, 2017*. IEEE Computer Society, 2962–2971. <https://doi.org/10.1109/CVPR.2017.316>
- [59] Petar Veličković, Guillem Cucurull, Arantxa Casanova, Adriana Romero, Pietro Lio, and Yoshua Bengio. 2017. Graph attention networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1710.10903* (2017).
- [60] Garrett Wilson and Diane J Cook. 2020. A survey of unsupervised deep domain adaptation. *ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology (TIST)* 11, 5 (2020), 1–46.
- [61] Bingzhe Wu, Jintang Li, Junchi Yu, Yatao Bian, Hengtong Zhang, CHaochao Chen, Chengbin Hou, Guoji Fu, Liang Chen, Tingyang Xu, et al. 2022. A Survey of Trustworthy Graph Learning: Reliability, Explainability, and Privacy Protection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.10014* (2022).
- [62] Jun Wu, Jingrui He, and Elizabeth Ainsworth. 2022. Non-IID Transfer Learning on Graphs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.08174* (2022).
- [63] Man Wu, Shirui Pan, Chuan Zhou, Xiaojun Chang, and Xingquan Zhu. 2020. Unsupervised Domain Adaptive Graph Convolutional Networks. In *WWW '20: The Web Conference 2020, Taipei, Taiwan, April 20-24, 2020*, Yennun Huang, Irwin King, Tie-Yan Liu, and Maarten van Steen (Eds.). ACM / IW3C2, 1457–1467. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3366423.3380219>
- [64] Jiaren Xiao, Quanyu Dai, Xiaochen Xie, Qi Dou, Ka-Wai Kwok, and James Lam. 2022. Domain adaptive graph infomax via conditional adversarial networks. *IEEE Transactions on Network Science and Engineering* 10, 1 (2022), 35–52.
- [65] Teng Xiao, Zhengyu Chen, Zhimeng Guo, Zeyang Zhuang, and Suhang Wang. 2022. Decoupled Self-supervised Learning for Non-Homophilous Graphs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.03601* (2022).
- [66] Teng Xiao, Zhengyu Chen, Donglin Wang, and Suhang Wang. 2021. Learning how to propagate messages in graph neural networks. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*. 1894–1903.
- [67] Junjie Xu, Enyan Dai, Xiang Zhang, and Suhang Wang. 2022. HP-GMN: Graph Memory Networks for Heterophilous Graphs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.08195* (2022).
- [68] Keyulu Xu, Weihua Hu, Jure Leskovec, and Stefanie Jegelka. 2018. How powerful are graph neural networks? *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.00826* (2018).
- [69] Hongliang Yan, Yukang Ding, Peihua Li, Qilong Wang, Yong Xu, and Wangmeng Zuo. 2017. Mind the Class Weight Bias: Weighted Maximum Mean Discrepancy for Unsupervised Domain Adaptation. In *2017 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR 2017, Honolulu, HI, USA, July 21-26, 2017*. IEEE Computer Society, 945–954. <https://doi.org/10.1109/CVPR.2017.107>
- [70] Luyu Yang, Yogesh Balaji, Ser-Nam Lim, and Abhinav Shrivastava. 2020. Curriculum manager for source selection in multi-source domain adaptation. In *Computer Vision—ECCV 2020: 16th European Conference, Glasgow, UK, August 23–28, 2020, Proceedings, Part XIV*. Springer, 608–624.
- [71] Yiding Yang, Zunlei Feng, Mingli Song, and Xinchao Wang. 2020. Factorizable graph convolutional networks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 33 (2020), 20286–20296.
- [72] Yaping Zhang, Shuai Nie, Wenju Liu, Xing Xu, Dongxiang Zhang, and Heng Tao Shen. 2019. Sequence-to-sequence domain adaptation network for robust text image recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 2740–2749.
- [73] Yizhou Zhang, Guojie Song, Lun Du, Shuwen Yang, and Yilun Jin. 2019. Dane: Domain adaptive network embedding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.00684* (2019).
- [74] Han Zhao, Shanghang Zhang, Guanhang Wu, José MF Moura, Joao P Costeira, and Geoffrey J Gordon. 2018. Adversarial multiple source domain adaptation. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 31 (2018).
- [75] Tianxiang Zhao, Dongsheng Luo, Xiang Zhang, and Suhang Wang. 2022. On Consistency in Graph Neural Network Interpretation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.13733* (2022).
- [76] Tianxiang Zhao, Dongsheng Luo, Xiang Zhang, and Suhang Wang. 2023. Faithful and Consistent Graph Neural Network Explanations with Rationale Alignment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.02791* (2023).
- [77] Tianxiang Zhao, Xiang Zhang, and Suhang Wang. 2022. Exploring edge disentanglement for node classification. In *Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2022*. 1028–1036.
- [78] Tianxiang Zhao, Xiang Zhang, and Suhang Wang. 2024. Disambiguated Node Classification with Graph Neural Networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.08824* (2024).

A Dataset Description

- **Citation.** In this dataset, we use three citation networks collected from ACM (ACM-V9), DBLP (DBLP-V7), and Microsoft Academic Graph (Citation-V1) respectively. Each node represents a paper and its descriptions are extracted as attributes using Bog-of-words. Edges denote citations, and nodes are labeled on the paper domain. We randomly split each network into two graphs and create a dataset of 6 graphs, which can increase the graph number and provide us with some prior knowledge on the similarity between graph pairs at the same time. This design can also help evaluate the effectiveness of our framework in selecting source domains. A sub-graph of Citation-V1 is used as the target.
- **Twitch.** This dataset is collected from the Twitch gamer platform, with nodes as Twitch users and edges as mutual follower relationships between them. This binary node classification task predicts whether a user streams explicit content. Six graphs are obtained based on the language used by the user: French, Spanish, Portuguese, German, English or Russian. The graph with language Russian is used as the target graph.
- **Yelp.** This dataset contains user reviews on Yelp to various point-of-interests (POIs) in different cities. We transform the reviews in each city into a graph, with each node representing a POI and each edge representing a co-review relationship. POI features are obtained by averaging the word embedding of its reviews, which is taken from the pre-trained language model GLOVE [45]. We perform classification on five classes, $\{Food, Shop, Home Service, Health Service, Finance\}$, and select six cities of different scales: $\{Madison, Glendale, Gilbert, Las Vegas, Toronto, Phoenix\}$. City Phoenix is used as the target graph.
- **Cora_full.** It is a citation network with nodes for papers and edges for citation relations. We cluster papers into 6 groups based on different frequencies in selected-words usage following GOOD [29] to generate 6 graphs and select one as the target.
- **Arxiv.** It is a large citation network among the computer science (CS) arXiv papers. The task is to predict the subject area of each paper. We split it into 6 disjoint graphs based on the published year of each paper [29], and use the most recent one as G_t .

The main statistics of these datasets are summarized in Table 3, including average node numbers and average edge numbers among graphs of each dataset.

Table 3: Statistics of processed graph datasets.

Name	#Graphs	#Nodes	#Edges	#Attributes	#Classes
Citation	6	3,963	6,428	6,775	5
Twitch	6	5,687	148,724	128	2
Yelp	6	13,903	232,525	100	6
Cora_full	6	3,298	3,697	8,710	70
Arxiv	6	28,223	66,166	128	40

B Baseline Introduction

- **Direct.** Instead of conducting explicit alignment in this baseline, we train a global model by using all the source domains and directly apply it to the target graph.
- **MMD** [69]. This baseline conducts cross-domain alignment by minimizing the maximum mean discrepancy (MMD) of embedding distributions between the source and target graphs.
- **Reverse** [25]. By augmenting feed-forward models with a simple new gradient reversal layer, this baseline can encourage discovering features that are not predictive towards domains.
- **Adversarial** [58] [63]. To capture generalizable features that are invariant across domains, this baseline adversarially trains a domain discriminator to distinguish the source and target domains. Model is learned to extract features that are both discriminative towards node labels and can fool the domain discriminator.
- **OptimalT** [15]. This baseline assumes a non-linear transformation between the joint feature/label space distributions across domains, and the model is adapted by minimizing this total transformation cost.
- **UDA-GCN** [63]: This method aligns source and target graphs with a domain classifier and includes classification entropy to promote classification boundaries of the target domain.
- **DistMDA** [55]. This method is designed for multi-source unsupervised domain adaptation, which makes a smoothness assumption on data distribution and estimates the weight of each source domain by minimizing the marginal probability difference. After obtaining source weights, Optimal transport is used for alignment. We extend it to graph-structured data by computing probability differences in the embedding space.
- **MDAN** [74]. A worst-case selection strategy is used in this work for multi-source unsupervised domain adaptation. We use its Soft-Max version to assign weights and then conduct OT-based adaptation.
- **MLDG** [37]. Meta-learning with synthesized virtual testing domains is utilized in this method in order to explicitly learn to generalize to the unseen domain with multiple source domains available. We implement it in the same setting as our SelMAG, with MAML [24] for the conduction of meta-learning part.

Note that MMD, Reverse, Adversarial, OptimalT, and UDA-GCN are originally designed for single-source domain adaptation. We extend them to MSUDA by taking all source domains as one, equivalent to giving the same weights to all source graphs.

C Time Complexity

In this part, we provide some analysis over the additional computation cost of our method. Note that during model adaptation process, at each batch, both baselines and our method have the same backbone GNN architectures and the domain distance estimator for alignment. In addition to these backbone modules, our algorithm needs an additional source domain selector. Denoting number of GNN layers as L , number of edges in the dataset as E , number of nodes as n and embedding dimension as d , for the backbone model, time complexity of GNN is $O(LEd + Lnd^2)$ and time complexity of distance estimator is $O(nd^2)$. For our model, the additional domain selector has the time complexity of $O(nd^2)$. Therefore, the proposed SelMAG will not result in a significant computation increase in adaptation. During learning, the time-consuming part of our model is to pretrain the graph modeling tasks. For a concrete example, on dataset Arxiv, which has 169,338 nodes, the pretraining step takes around one hour. Note that this pretraining step is only needed once across different running, hence its cost would not pose a severe problem.